

linked document and (2) an importance of the linking documents.

~~21~~ 47. The method of claim ~~46~~²⁰, wherein the importance of the linking documents is based on a number of documents that link to the linking documents.

~~22~~ 48. The method of claim ~~18~~¹, wherein the assigning a score includes:
associating one or more backlinks with each of the linked documents, each of the backlinks corresponding to one of the linking documents that links to the linked document, assigning a weight to each of the backlinks, and
determining a score for each of the linked documents based on a number of backlinks for the linked document and the weights assigned to the backlinks.

E5 ~~23~~ 49. The method of claim ~~48~~²⁰, wherein the processing of the linked documents includes:
organizing the linked documents based on the determined scores.

~~24~~ 50. The method of claim ~~48~~²², wherein the assigning a weight includes:
assigning different weights to at least some of the backlinks associated with at least one of the linked documents.

~~25~~ 51. The method of claim ~~18~~¹, wherein the assigning a score includes:
associating one or more backlinks with each of the linked documents, each of the backlinks corresponding to one of the linking documents that links to the linked document, assigning a weight to each of the backlinks, and

determining a score for each of the linked documents based on a sum of the weights assigned to the backlinks associated with the linked document.

²⁶
32. The method of claim ²⁵~~31~~, wherein the weights assigned to each of the backlinks are independent of text of the corresponding linking documents.

²¹
33. The method of claim ¹~~18~~, wherein the assigning a score includes:
determining the score primarily based on linking information.

E5
²⁸
34. The method of claim ¹~~18~~, wherein the assigning a score includes:
determining the score substantially independent of user-query content.

²⁷
35. The method of claim ¹~~18~~, wherein the assigning a score includes:
iteratively determining the score for a linked document, the score being primarily based on document-linking information and substantially independent of user-query content. —

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18, 25, 28, and 38-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Ishikawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,848,407); rejected claims 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishikawa et al.; rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishikawa et al. in view of Applicant's allegedly admitted prior art; rejected claims 21, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishikawa et al. in view of Egger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,494); and rejected claims 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's allegedly admitted prior art in view of Egger et al.